From: Jamie Gray

Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2016 8:27 AM

To: Nolan Bobroff

Subject: FW: Comments on Agenda Item 18 - Old Mammoth Place Amendment

From: Jo Bacon [mailto:jo@eccotone.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2016 6:42 AM

To: John Wentworth; Colin Fernie; Shields Richardson; Bill Sauser; Cleland Hoff

Cc: Jamie Gray

Subject: Comments on Agenda Item 18 - Old Mammoth Place Amendment

Councilmembers:

The Old Mammoth Place Amendment before you is for a more massive and bulky project than was previously approved. The increased height at the edges on Sierra Nevada and Laurel Mountain Roads that are only a two-lane street away from residences negate the previously negotiated stepping back of the project to be less massive both to these homes and to pedestrians.

What I don't see in the documentation is any rationale for how this supports all three pieces of the triple bottom line. Economic is obvious, especially for the project proponent, but in what way does this increase the social or natural capital?

I respectfully request that you evaluate the project not just based on its economic "value" but also for impacts on the surrounding properties and the community. As is stated in our General Plan, "...Decisions that only benefit one and decrease the other two forms of capital are undesirable."

Jo Bacon

From: Jamie Gray

Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2016 11:47 AM

To: Bill Sauser; Cleland Hoff; Colin Fernie; John Wentworth; Shields Richardson

Cc: Nolan Bobroff; Dan Holler **Subject:** FW: Agenda Item 18, July 20

From: Sharon Clark [mailto:sharonr.clark@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2016 11:41 AM

To: Jamie Gray

Subject: Agenda Item 18, July 20

Hi Jamie,

Please include the following in each TC member packet.

Thanks, Sharon

The Honorable Mammoth Lakes Town Council Members:

Then it was decided that the project could not be built with the General Plan Zoning Codes. OMP *could* be built with Zoning Codes tailored *just* for that site so we got the Clearwater Specific Plan. The Planning Commission approved the CSP with a 6 story building height of 65 feet. However, the Town Council, knowing how locals respected and appreciated their trees scaled the OMP project back to a 5 story building height of 55 feet. Now, 6 years later, OMP, is back again asking for an amendment that will allow a 6 story building height of 65 feet. Excessive heights affect views from town of our magnificent mountains. But please consider the views from our mountains of our town. As you ski or bike down Mammoth or Lincoln Mountains, hike or bike to the top of the Knolls or Panorama Dome, what do you see? You see a "Village in the Trees", you see a carpet of green tree tops. A complex with a 65 foot building will bulge up from that green canopy like a sore thumb.

Developers know that when they submit plans to build a project in any town, there are Zoning Codes, requirements and criteria put in place by the people in that town. The wise developer would adhere to that town's preference, i.e., Mammoth Lakes' Zoning Codes, so there would be no need to ask for special preference. This prudent process should also include a sound business plan that would allow lenders and investors a fair return on their money.

A 6 story building with a height of 65 feet flies in the face of our long established 5 story, 55 feet tall building height. 55 feet tall buildings respect our "Village in the Trees". If you approve a 65 foot tall building, there

will be no turning back. Future projects/developments will request and expect a similar approval.	I ask you to
protect the integrity of our tree canopy, that no man made structure should be taller than 55 feet.	

Thank you,

Sharon Raven Clark

From: Cheryl Chipman [mailto:cchipman58@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2016 12:38 PM

To: Nolan Bobroff

Subject: Re: Old Mammoth Place Amendment - Town Council July 20, 2016

Comments on Clearwater Project aka Old Mammoth Place

To the Mammoth Lakes Town Council,

In regards to the Clearwater project on Old Mammoth Rd: I oppose the request for a height variance to the project and think the CEQA analysis of the viewshed was not done comprehensively. There were only two locations considered for this--very near the project, whereas if this project is allowed to reach 65 feet, it will be able to be seen and impair views from all over the area, from the Von's shopping center to Footloose. To do an adequate analysis, it should have been conducted from several places in town and probably from the top of Mammoth Mountain as well. These are public viewing areas that would be significant viewing areas.

Additionally, once one variance is granted, I predict it will continue to be in every request in the future. I lived in Vail for 15 years and saw one project exceed the height limitations after another, until there was no sun on the streets in the winters! I keep hearing people in Mammoth, including Rusty Gregory, say they don't want to become another Vail--for a number of reasons--and this is the first step to creating one monstrosity after another.

Note: I do not oppose the project--just the height proposal variance. Economic viability is not the reason to grant a variance to a project. It is not the responsibility of the town and its residents to be sure the project will produce income. If not this project, another one more palatable will come along.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Chipman Resident

From: MarySue Brubaker <msbru21jan@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, July 20, 2016 11:46 AM

To: Nolan Bobroff

Subject: Project at Sierra Nevada Inn Property

To Mammoth Planning Commission:

Krystal Villa East HOA are very much against the proposed project especially the height and density.

The owners and the board of Krystal Villa East HOA Board Members are opposed of this project.

Adi Hyttenberg, President, Steve Brubaker, Vice President, Steven Burkholder, Secretary, Gerrie Calhoun, Treasurer, Dave East, Member at large.

Thanks for your consideration in this matter.

Krystal Villa East HOA Board and Owners